

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 10 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicants cancel claim 3 by way of this Amendment.

#### **I. Claim Objections**

Claim 1 is objected to because of a spelling error. Applicants correct the error to obviate this objection.

#### **II. Claim Rejections - § 112**

Claims 1-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants amend claim 1 to replace “vinyl polymer” with “acrylic polymer”. This subject matter is fully supported by the originally filed claim 3; claim 3 is cancelled accordingly. This change is believed to overcome the rejection.

#### **III. Claim Rejections - § 103(a)**

Claims 1-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Barrera (5,965,256) in view of newly cited Ellison et al. (5,342,666).

### **Analysis**

Claim 1 is the only claim in independent form; therefore, the following discussion is initially directed to this independent claim.

To review briefly, claim 1 is directed to a pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet comprising a composite film comprised by a composition containing a urethane polymer and a vinyl polymer as effective components, a first film comprising a material different from that of the composite

film, the first film laminated on one side of the composite film, and a pressure-sensitive adhesive layer formed on the other side of the composite film.

Applicants clarify the materials of the first film to be made of at least one resin selected from the group consisting of polyethylene terephthalate, polyethylene, polypropylene, polyimides, polyether ether ketones, polyvinyl chloride resins, polyvinylidene chloride resins, polyamide resins, and polycarbonate resins.

Thus, claim 1 has been amended so that the group does not include urethane resins. Therefore, even if the weatherable polymer such as polyurethane showed in Ellison et al. is used in the first film (fluoro-containing film) of Barrera, the first film of the present invention is not disclosed in this combination of references.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

The remaining rejections are directed to the dependent claims. These claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, by virtue of their dependency therefrom.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
Application No.: 10/625,527

Attorney Docket No.: Q76642

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ellen R. Smith/

---

Ellen R. Smith  
Registration No. 43,042

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 24, 2008